(b) if so, the details thereof separately during 1988-89, 1989-90 and 1990-91 upto June, 1991;

(c) whether expenditure on R.P.F. has been increased by thirty times from First Plan period;

(d) if so, the reasons for increase in pilferage and thefts;

(e) whether Government propose to take some concrete steps in this regard; and

(f) if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI MALLIKARJUN): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) Yes, Sir. This is mainly due to increase in establishment charges such as salary, D.A. etc.

(d) There has been no increase in runnier of cases of thefts of railway property. In fact, the number of cases of thefts have declined by 25.85 per cent during last 10 years.

(e) and (f) The followng preventive measures are being taken to prevent thefts and pilferage of Railway property:-

1. Escorting of trains carrying valuable and important consignments as fat as possible.
2. Intensive beat patrolling in yards and other vulnerable areas/sections.
3. Joint checking at interchange points to take stock of the condition of wagons carrying consignments vulnerable to theft etc.
4. RPF armed pickets are posted/deployed in vulnerable secions as far as possible.
5. Plain clothed RPF personnel are also deployed to collect crime intelligence with a view to tracking down the criminals.
6. Dog squads are deployed for patrolling in vulnerable yards and areas as per their availability.
7. Close co-ordination between the RPF, the GRP and the local police is maintained at various levels to deal -with criminals and receivers of stolen property.

Draw of the allotment of flats for EWS by the slum wine of DDA

1846. SHRI SYED SIBTEY RAZI: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to refer to reply to Unstarred Question 489 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 19th July, 1991 and state:

(a) whether some applications were rejected before the draw;

(b) if so, the basis for rejection,

(c) whether applicants of rejected applications have been advised in advance;

(d) whether successful applicants of the draw have also been advised till now; and

(e) if so, the details thereof and it not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM); (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) 35 applications were rejected due to incomplete information/documents.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) and (e) Date and time of the draw was published in the local news papers. The draw was held on 30.11.1991 and the list of 92 successful applicants was displayed on the notice boards. Demand-cum-allotment letters are under issue.